## 2014 Delft, Netherlands Conference Report for Winter Policy Council Meeting February 9, 2015

Submitted on behalf of the Conference Team by Roberta L. Spencer

*Conference Attendance:* The conference had 485 registrants and 62 guests from 57 countries. See below for details on attendee demographics:

Year	Members	Students	Authors	New	City	Registrants
2014	64%	28%	62%	33%	Delft	485
2013	66%	23%	51%	33%	Cambridge	543
2012	68%	24%	58%	40%	St. Gallen	455
2011	61%	21%	50%	42%	Washington	550
2010	52%	35%	57%	40%	Seoul	305

*Effect of Asia-Pacific Conference on Delft Attendance:* There was a concern in advance of the Delft conference that attendance from the Asia Pacific areas would decrease due to the conference being held in Japan in February 2014. The attendance numbers (2005-2014) by continent are below:

	2014	2013	2012	2011	2010	2009	2008	2007	2006	2005
	Delft	Camb	St. G	DC	Seoul	ABQ	Athens	Boston	Nij	Boston
Africa	3%	1%	1%	1%	6%	3%	10%	2%	2	1
N Amer	21%	54%	23%	61%	17%	62%	22%	53%	28	60
C/S Amer	6%	8%	4%	5%	3%	5%	5%	4%	3	3
Asia	15%	10%	16%	10%	45%	8%	5%	8%	9	8
Pacific	1%	2%	3%	2%	4%	2%	4%	4%	3	3
Europe	54%	25%	53%	21%	25%	20%	54%	29%	55	25
Total %	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100	100
# of										
countries	57	50	50	47	41	44	51	50	46	43

*Conference Sponsors:* Conference Dynamics Partners were TU Delft Aula Congress Centre and Greenwood Strategic Advisors / Ventana Systems, Inc. For a full list of conference sponsors, please see the permanent Delft Conference website: <u>http://www.systemdynamics.org/conferences/2014/index.html</u>.

*Conference Organizers:* Program Chairs, Pål Davidsen and Etiënne Rouwette; Organizing Chairs Erik Pruyt, Wil A. H. Thissen, and C. Els van Daalen; Workshop Chairs, Jack B. Homer and Hazhir Rahmandad; and Conference Manager, Roberta L. Spencer worked alongside the Home Office staff, Monique van der Toorn-Fennema and many volunteers to make the conference a success.

*Program:* The Public Policy thread had the highest percentage of papers reviewed. Individual thread percentages were as follows on reviewed and accepted papers:

Public Policy	13%	Operations	5%
Health	12%	Human Behavior	5%
Environment	11%	Strategy	5%
Resources	10%	Learning and Teaching	4%
Business	9%	Information and Knowledge	4%
Methodology	8%	Security	4%
Economics	6%	Stakeholder Engagement	4%

## 2014 Delft, Netherlands Conference Report for Winter Policy Council Meeting February 9, 2015

## Submitted on behalf of the Conference Team by Roberta L. Spencer

The rejection rate was just over 18%.

506 submissions were handled through the online system. Submission types included plenary, parallel, poster, workshop, roundtables, meetings, PhD submissions, and other miscellaneous items. We sincerely appreciate the efforts of the hundreds of dedicated conference paper reviewers. Over the past few years, this table below shows how many reviews have been assigned and completed.

<b>Conference Year</b>	<b>Reviews Assigned</b>	<b>Reviews Completed</b>	% Completed
2011 DC	999	927	92.79%
2012 St. Gallen	1227	1067	86.96%
2013 Cambridge	1086	1002	92.27%
2014 Delft	1127	996	88.38%

New events in 2014 included Twin Sessions, the Conference LinkedIn Page, and the System Dynamics Summer School.

Successful continuing events included the Poster Symposium and Buffet (with favorite posters contest), the Welcome Reception, Award Ceremonies, PhD Colloquium, Roundtables, Modeling Assistance Workshop, Thursday Workshop Day including "Getting Started With ... Software" Workshops, PC Meet and Greet, Sunday HPSIG Session, Exhibitor Demonstrations, Red Ribbon Event, Users' Group Meetings, Spouses' Lounge and the Newcomer Orientation Session.

*Finances:* The Delft Conference surplus was about \$18,000 (this number will change somewhat after the annual review by our CPA). The conference revenue goal was estimated between \$1,400 and \$18,000, with the budget-estimated registration count between 452 and 520. Actual registrations were 485 (includes 24 Business Day registrations). Revenues from registration were very close to the adjusted average expectation and sponsorship lines were strong. On the expense side, costs were higher than estimated.

Please let us know if you have any questions or comments.